

REMARKS

Claims Rejection – 35 USC §112

Claims 3 and 10 have been rejected under § 112, second paragraph. The phrase “and from each packet data unit as the sequence number of the packet data units” was identified as unclear, as there seemed to be no action involved. This phrase ends a list items from which a set of parameters is obtained. The set of parameters is related to the step of deciphering data. Accordingly, this phrase is not unclear as not relating to an action, rather it relates to a possible source from which parameters are obtained to be acted upon, in the deciphering step. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims Rejection – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 8-11, 13 and 14 have been rejected under § 103(a) based upon Takagi (US Published Application 2001/0047474) in view of Malek (US Patent No. 4,920,567).

Claims 5 and 12 have been rejected under §103(a) based upon the combination of ‘474 and ‘567, further in view of Low *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,959,346).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 to further clarify that the present invention relates to communications monitoring, such as protocol analysis, or procedure trace, as provided in paragraph [0011].

In the rejection, it was indicated that ‘474 teaches a system of communications monitoring, when in fact ‘474 teaches data relaying, rather than communications monitoring. Applicant understands that communications monitoring was provided in the claim preamble, so in the interest of providing greater clarity, amended the claims to provide for the monitoring operations of protocol analysis, or procedure trace as explicit limitations in the claim. The ‘567 reference relates to a secure telephone terminal, and does not describe communications monitoring, such as protocol analysis, or procedure trace. Similarly, ‘346 relates to packet encryption, and again does not provide for deciphering in connection with the monitoring of a communications system. As the references ‘474, ‘567 and ‘346, alone or in combination, do not describe the deciphering systems or methods in connection with a

monitoring system or a monitoring method as provided by amended independent claim 1 and 8, the claims cannot be held obvious based upon this combination. The remaining claims depend either directly, or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, applicants request that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

Based upon the amendments and arguments provided above, applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed and this application passed on to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Antonio Bovo, Michele Fioravanti, and
Alessio Biasutto

By: Matthew D. Rabdau /

Matthew D. Rabdau
Reg. No. 43026
(503) 627-5068 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

May 21, 2007

Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 97077

7368 US